DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 175 UD 009 139

By-Ferver, Jack C., Ed.

Seminar on Educating the Disadvantaged: A Report (Madison, Wisc., April 9-10, 1969).

Spons Agency-Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Apr 69
Note-35p.
Available from-Center for Extension Programs in Education, 606 State St., Madison, Wis. 53706 ($1.00)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.85
Descriptors-*Compensatory Education Programs, *Disadvantaged Youth, Educational Change, Educational Disadvantagement, *Educational Opportunities, *Evaluation Techniques, Parent School Relationship, Political Influences, Political Power, *Program Design, Program Development, Remedial Programs, School Community Relationship, Teacher Education
Identifiers-University of Wisconsin

At this seminar, Mario Fantini, Program Officer of the Ford Foundation, discussed the theoretical frameworks on which educational programs for deprived children should be designed. Program designs required to provide effective education for poor and deprived children were explored by Kenneth Haskins, Principal of the Adams-Morgan School, Washington, D.C. Rodney Skager, Program Director of the Center for the Study of Evaluation, spoke on the evaluation techniques needed to analyze the effectiveness of compensatory education. The operational principles and political strategies required to enhance educational opportunities for poor children and youth were discussed respectively by Harland Randolph, Vice President of Federal City College, Washington D.C., and former Senator Wayne Morse. (EM)

ED033175

# SEMINAR ON EDUCATING THE DISADVANTAGED

Report

The University of Wisconsin

ED033175

09139 E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# SEMINAR ON EDUCATING THE DISADVANTAGED

Report of a National Invitational
Seminar held with assistance from
the Ford Foundation

VD 009 139

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
THE WISCONSIN CENTER
MADISON, WISCONSIN
April 9-10, 1969

This Seminar on Educating the Disadvantaged Report is distributed free to Seminar participants. Additional copies may be obtained by sending $1.00 to:

Center for Extension Programs
in Education
606 State Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Copies of Seminar on Educating the Disadvantaged Position Papers presented at the seminar may also be obtained by sending $2.00 to the ~~same address.~~

Extension Bookstore
B-7 Extension Bldg.
The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Report Editor:

Dr. Jack C. Ferver
Director
Center for Extension
Programs in Education
The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....1
Authors of Position Papers....., 1-2

Problem.....2

Principles.....5
Principle 1.....6
Principle 2.....10
Principle 3.....10
Principle 4.....10
Principle 5.....24
Principle 6.....27

Call to Action .....28

Summary Observations.....31

## INTRODUCTION

Fifty persons representing diverse parts of our society were invited to Madison, Wisconsin in April, 1969, to participate in a University of Wisconsin Seminar on Educating the Disadvantaged. In his letter of invitation, University President Fred Harvey Harrington said:

> It is becoming increasingly obvious that unless some benchmarks are developed which give substance to efforts being directed at providing the poor and the deprived in our public and nonpublic schools with quality education designed to meet their special needs, those without an advocacy will again be denied. For this reason, this two-day invitational seminar is being held to deal with the theoretical and practical problems evolving around compensatory education.

Seminar Chairman Alexander Plante of the Connecticut Department of Education kept driving participants to reach "consensus" on a few major issues that might be translated into productive action.

Seminar discussions were organized about five position papers presented by individuals who are respected as leaders in their fields.* Papers and their authors were:

1. "The theoretical frameworks on which educational programs for poor and deprived children should be designed."
   Mario Fantini, Program Officer
   Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

2. "The program designs required to provide effective education for poor and deprived children."
   Kenneth Haskins, Principal
   Adams-Morgan School, Washington, D.C.

3. "The evaluation techniques needed to analyze the effectiveness of compensatory education."
   Rodney Skager, Assistant Professor
   Graduate School of Education, UCLA
   and Program Director
   Center for the Study of Evaluation

---

*Copies of these five position papers may be obtained by sending $2.00 to the Center for Extension Programs in Education, Rm. 1013, 606 State St., The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

4. "The operational principles needed to insure that educational opportunities for children and youth are enhanced."

Harland Randolph, Vice President
Planning and Development
Federal City College, Washington, D.C.

5. "The political strategies which are needed to implement programs for poor and deprived children."

The Honorable Wayne Morse
Washington, D.C.

After a brief statement of the problem facing our country in educating the disadvantaged, this report of the seminar concentrates on pulling from the position papers and discussions a sampling of thoughts that contributed to the formulation of six principles that received major, though not always full consensus.

The University of Wisconsin believes this was a highly important seminar and that the outcomes reported here are worthy of the attention of America. The University is indebted to the Ford Foundation for helping to make the seminar possible.

PROBLEM

Over 12 million children under the age of 18 live in poverty with all that poverty implies--poor diets, substandard homes, inadequate clothing, poor recreation facilities and all the other physical limitations of which most Americans are now aware. Just as important, however, are the social-psychological effects of poverty on these 12 million children--the effects that come with the lack of respect for them and their cultures th at they sense on the part of the more affluent Americans, the effects that come with discrimination, injustice, and inequality.

Of great concern to the Nation are the relationships between poverty and lack of educational opportunity. Minority group children raised in poverty score lower on verbal and non-verbal tests when they enter school than the average white child, and they seldom have caught up by twelfth grade if they have not dropped out before that time.

Only a small percentage of children of the poor go to college--a longitudinal study in Wisconsin showed that children with high ability but low socio-economic status were less apt to go to college and complete college than children with low ability but high socio-economic status.

To seminar participants breaking the cycle of "poor family-poor education-poor job—poor family" was viewed as a major challenge, and compensatory education was viewed as a high potential means of breaking this cycle.

Some $2 billion a year in Federal, state and local funds are now going into compensatory education for children from low-income families. As its name implies, compensatory education is designed primarily to help these children learn how to learn and to compensate for the deprivations, both economic and educational, of their environments.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act is the largest Federal program in support of compensatory education, being funded at $1 billion annually. In addition to providing special academic help, Title I also provides health, dental and nutritional services when needed. One major limitation of Title I is that its $1 billion is only about half

the amount authorized by Congress, and much too limited to do the necessary job with only about $125 to invest in each disadvantaged student.

In addition to the problems caused by lack of adequate funding, other problems have plagued compensatory education. Three additional problems of particular concern to the seminar participants were:

1. Compensatory education has often been used to try to bring schools "up to par with other schools in both physical and human resources," and in most instances, even after programs of compensatory education are added to deprived schools, the schools in the more affluent parts of the country remain ahead. The belief of seminar participants was that we should only begin to talk of "compensation" after equality or parity for the present poor and deprived schools has been obtained.
2. The criteria used in evaluating compensatory education programs are suspect. Standardized achievement tests are usually used to assess the results of compensatory education programs, and these tests are felt to have limited relevance to many poor people who now are striving for a dignity of their own.
3. Compensatory education, if not all education for the poor, has been too unresponsive to the wishes of the poor, too much under the control of the "establishment."

PRINCIPLES

In the first paper reviewed at the seminar, Mario Fantini challenged the traditional diagnosis and prescription of many existing educational programs for the poor. Points he made were further developed by others and served as a basis for a set of principles adopted later in the seminar. He said:

> Influenced by the War on Poverty and civil rights movements, the problems of the poor, including educational problems, were identified and tackled. The model for diagnosis was simple, the prescription direct: There were masses of children, mostly minority and poor, who were not being educated properly. These populations were viewed as failing largely as a result of their deprived backgrounds. They were "culturally deprived." They were seen as suffering from "environmental deficits" which handicapped them in school.
>
> Given such an assessment, it followed that to remedy the problem would necessitate a massive concentration of remedial educational efforts. "Culturally deprived" learners needed compensatory education into which their deficits could be "plugged." Thus, if children were behind in reading we needed more reading teachers; if children lacked motivation, we needed more counselors; if children lacked cultural experiences, we needed more field trips, more cultural enrichment; etc.....
>
> But the compensatory approach is viewed with increasing distrust by the parents of academic failures both because the techniques are not achieving their goals, and because these parents are rejecting the premise that the fault lies in their children....
>
> For me, the new diagnosis focuses more on the institution and the relation between institutional

> obsolescence and student failure. In essence, the problems of the disadvantaged, and the urban educational crises are themselves symptoms of a more basic problem--institutional obsolescence. The schools, as institutions, need to be updated....
>
> Moreover, there is a growing shift of emphasis by minority group members themselves away from desegregation at the option of the white majority. The new focus of racial-minority parents is on power and control over the schools their children attend...enter participation. The clients of our schools--especially urban schools--are demanding a voice in updating education.

These observations by Mario Fantini as well as those by other seminar participants contributed to a statement of six principles which received major consensus toward the end of the seminar. A statement of each of the six principles follows, along with selections from discussions which contributed to or grew out of each statement of principle.

Principle 1

The primary source of the prevailing academic retardation among children of the poor is the social pathology associated with poverty and discrimination. All educational programs for the disadvantaged should be designed and evaluated in terms of their impact upon these conditions.

Discussion

The most prevalent kind of educational disadvantagement and the kind to which this seminar group largely addressed itself

was the disadvantagement associated with poverty and discrimination. The question came to be not "to what extent is education making people more comfortable in poverty?" but "to what extent is education reducing poverty?" Education was viewed as a "closed system" in which education had become relevant to education and not to life. Educators were viewed as professionals who had "found a way of being secure on a sinking ship."

Compensatory education was viewed as too often dealing in the past "with symptoms, with strengthened doses of prescriptions that have been ineffective before--more trips, more remedial reading, etc.--without real differences in kind. The assumption is that schools need to do somewhat more for disadvantaged pupils, but it does not presume that the school itself is in need of wholesale re-examination."

Evaluations of programs for the disadvantaged have been "overwhelmingly limited to the program certification facet" which is "simply the educational counterpart of a good housekeeping seal of approval." The standardized test has been the usual measurement of program effectiveness as programs have been conceived in the past, but the appropriateness of standardized tests may be even more suspect if programs are to be evaluated for "their impact on poverty and discrimination." "Surely it is time to utilize evaluation procedures that do more than establish grounds for final judgments

about educational programs," said Rodney Skager. "Evaluation will be most productive when it is seen as part of a process helping to render those final judgments favorable."

Discrimination in the larger society and in its schools was accepted by seminar participants as a fact. "Even after programs of compensatory education are added to the deprived schools, the schools in the more affluent parts of the country remain ahead. They normally have all that has been given to the poor schools as compensation, plus more. This is taken for granted and not given a label such as compensation. I contend, therefore," stated Kenneth Haskins, "that before we even begin to talk about compensation we first must make certain that these poor and deprived schools are brought up to par with other schools in both physical and human resources."

How can discrimination be attacked through compensatory education programs? "Participation in," "power to," and "control over" were the key phrases used in discussing this problem. The power to define the goals of compensatory education must first be shifted from the usually white and frequently discriminatory establishment to the students and their parents who are the supposed beneficiaries of this compensation. Would one then find in program descriptions, as is now frequently the case, the stated goal "to change behavior patterns of children of poor backgrounds

and to instill in them the importance of proper social behavior and achievement?" Continued discrimination was seen as increasingly intolerable and it was felt that minority groups must be given the power to prevent discrimination in matters affecting the minds of their children. It was argued that if educational disadvantaged communities could gain control over their schools they could then negotiate with the dominant community those conditions which would prevent discrimination. This concept was developed by Mario Fantini in the following way:

> The implication for public education is greater participation by Negroes in control over predominantly Negro schools. This is rather different from the "separate but equal" doctrine, since some "black power" philosophers reason that when Negroes achieve quality education under their own aegis, they will then be prepared to connect (integrate) with white society on a groundwork of parity instead of deficiency. A good school then would be defined not by the kind of children who attend it, but by the quality of education offered by the school. In short, they seek connection as equals.
>
> The goals of integration, therefore, must be broadened to restore a quality that has been sidetracked in the emphasis on the educational-achievement goal of desegregation, and of equating <u>assimilation</u> with integration. That is, we must recognize that viewing diversity and differences as assets rather than unfortunate barriers to homogeneity has as positive effect on human growth and development as the teaching of academic skills. All of which is to suggest that militant Negro demands for participation in control of public education are actually a means of greater connection to society, precisely opposite from the connections of separatism usually associated with "black power." Desegregation as a path to quality education has been legitimized as an alternative. However, this is a limited option--the major thrust of intervention for the poor remains compensatory education.

Principle 2

(Since this principle and the two that follow deal with improving the means of form and content in order to more effectively accomplish the ends of meeting the needs of disadvantaged children, they are listed and discussed together.)

The persistence of gross academic retardation among children of the poor stems mainly from the failure of the school to adapt its forms and content to the needs of learners from impoverished backgrounds.

Principle 3

Children socialized under conditions of poverty and discrimination can and do learn effectively in school when provided with curricular experiences appropriate to their developmental needs.

Principle 4

Major reorganization and innovation in prevailing school systems including curricula, instructional materials, teaching methods, educational research, grouping practices, financing, teacher education, utilization of community resources, and community relations are essential in order for the school to serve disadvantaged children effectively.

Discussion

Basic in the discussion of these principles is the belief often stated or implied in the seminar that "it is not the children who have failed; it is the schools that have failed." As this became

an accepted basis for discussion the following questions were asked: (1) What are the needs of the poor children that schools have failed to meet? (2) How might the content or curriculum be redesigned to more effectively meet these needs? and (3) What redesigned educational forms could more effectively meet the needs of poor children?

1. Needs of children of the poor

Attention of seminar participants was limited to those particular needs of children raised under conditions of poverty and discrimination, including the following:

a. The capability of coping with the conditions imposed by poverty and discrimination

b. A heightened sense of individual worth

c. Knowledge of and pride in one's own cultural heritage, including the language

d. A sense of values as defined by the community

e. The ability to generalize

2. Content or curriculum

The importance of providing a flexible, relevant curriculum for the disadvantaged was pointed out by Wayne Morse while discussing another topic--political strategies:

> The best political strategy is to create successful education programs which are adjustable

> to the great differences that exist among students. Unless the program meets the differing needs of all students, no political strategy can save it. The best strategy is providing educational opportunities through flexible programs designed to meet the varied needs of individual students regardless of race, place of residence or economic circumstances.

A curriculum model meeting the criteria of flexibility and relevance was presented in some detail by Mario Fantini. This model was seen to be emerging from expressions of students, parents, community groups, and professionals concerned with reform, and having at least the following four sets of educational objectives:

a. Focus on academic skills and subject matter mastery. These are the objectives that dominate the standard educational institutions--attending, evaluating, etc., which are included in the learning-to-learn skills. Individual instruction and use of paraprofessional and student tutorial services would be emphasized in reaching these objectives.

b. Focus on individual talents, interests and innate ability of learners. Whereas the first set of objectives was fed to the child, this second set draws from him in the form of whatever latent talents

or abilities exist or may be discovered. Those processes usually associated with vocational education, stressing experientially oriented learning processes, would be linked to these objectives.

c. Focus on issues and problems of social action which are personally related to the learner. This set of objectives deals with the political socialization of the students, such as having learners acquire the skills of negotiating with adults. The approach to these objectives would be highly clinical and experiential, utilizing community talent in community settings.

d. Focus on exploration of self and others. This set ranges from the personalogical (intrapersonal) to the sociological (interpersonal) domains. The issues of identity, power, and connectedness pervade both spheres, and come to grips with the learner's concern for "Who am I? Who are we? What does school have to do with me?"

Fantini concluded his presentation of the educational objectives summarized above by indicating basic shifts that would be required. He said:

> For example, the objectives point to an expanded view of the learning environment--the classroom becomes the community. Some of these shifts can be summarized as follows:

| FROM | TO |
|---|---|
| uniform | diversified |
| symbolistic | experiential |
| remote | immediate |
| what | why |
| academic | participatory |
| antiseptic | reality-oriented |
| cognitive-extrinsic content | cognitive-intrinsic-affective content |

3. Form

Conference participants called for much more than "educational add-ons" to the present forms of compensatory education. They viewed education as suffering from institutional obsolescence in which most of the learners are disadvantaged. Called for was a new conception of education that is functionally linked to the concerns and aspirations of the public that depends on it.

Mario Fantini stated:

> What is called for is a system of universal education from early childhood through college, a system which has the capability of educating fully a diverse learning population. This is a monumental undertaking and the biggest problem facing education in the decades to come. Without such a system the cultivation of human resources of the society will be seriously curtailed.
>
> The development of a new educational process geared to diversity will be a search. It will not simply be replacing one orthodoxy with another--one monolithic structure for another. An updated institution will possess a process which is flexible, adapting, and self-revitalizing. It will not have the answers but will engage in a continuous inquiry into better ways of educating people.
>
> The transition from compensatory education to institutional reform, if it is to be made, represents the major task for educational strategists.

Harland Randolph described the emerging role of education in this way:

> The emerging role of education is calling for a system in which the informal learning experiences,

> the businesses, the community groups, and a whole series of learning resources are in some way coordinated to produce a learning environment in which the principle focus is on how the student is able to organize for himself the various learning resources.

Kenneth Haskins would establish the following requirements upon new educational forms of compensatory programs for the poor and disadvantaged:

a. First and foremost, compensatory programs must be defined and controlled by those people whose children are to be served.

b. These programs must be massive enough and long enough in duration to provide for a revolutionary change in the educational institution itself as well as in the educational process and method.

c. The method of funding should allow real experimentation, including the ability to change techniques or approaches in midyear or midmonth. A program should be able to alter an approach when serious questions emerge.

d. Concrete, visible changes, such as building renovations, buses owned by the group, etc., should be possible under a definition of compensatory.

e. The roles of teachers and administrators must be re-examined in the light of new decision makers and changes made. New approaches to training and re-training teachers must be designed, plus the machinery included to remove those teachers who are unable or unwilling to make necessary changes. Continual examination of ways to broaden the base of "educators" beyond the "credentialed" is necessary.

The concensus of seminar participants was that major changes in the forms of education in general are overdue, and

that changes in the forms for compensatory education in particular must be made now. The forms of the required system which are necessary are those which would have the openness and flexibility to follow the functions of a flexible curriculum. The following compilation of comments points to some of the changes called for:

a. View of the poor parent and his child.

"People want the kind of school where they and their children are treated with respect and allowed to carry themselves with dignity."

b. View of the school in relation to the community.

"We should consider not only the formal education of children within the school building, as is now the case, but the broad use of the community for education and the use of the school for the community."

"People will not support a program unless they play a meaningful role in that program--unless they feel they are important to that program."

c. View of school teachers and administrators.

"Teachers and administrators who are unable to see themselves working for the minority community should very quickly rethink their positions or move elsewhere."

"Those in control will no longer be interested in teachers defining their roles as 'making these children acceptable to the larger society.'"
"Whereas the standard educational system operated on a flow of decision making which traveled from the top down, the reformed system proceeds from the bottom up. This means that the agents closest to the learner--teachers, parents, other students--must increase their capabilities for decision making. Institutional vehicles need to be created which enhance this capacity. One such vehicle is the teacher-trainer/teacher team. As this team begins to develop proposals for change, the role of the school administrator is changed. He becomes a facilitator for proposals developed by teachers. Parents, students, and community residents can also participate in these instructional-team planning sessions."

d. View of teacher credentialing. (The views expressed here did not have complete support.)
"Salary scales based on the hours of education and length of service are not going to bring good teachers into the school system or get rid of the

incompetents. It may be that a new pay scale system based on a whole new concept of standards for promotion would be in order; one where a panel of teachers, elected by teachers, is set up. Each year, each teacher in the system would be evaluated by the panel on the basis of performance."

"The test of professional efficiency and promotion should place emphasis on performance with students and parent-community participants."

e. View of teacher training.

"The changing institution will necessitate a shift in conception of staff development. Since present training agencies are themselves tied to an outdated educational process, they have a limited impact on professional behavior. Most behavior is shaped on the job by the nature of the institutions. Outdated institutions produce outdated behavior; consequently as institutions are changed, so will the behavior of those in them.

"The changing school becomes the clinic in which roles and behavior are shaped. In order to enhance this process, a systematic on-the-job staff development program is needed. This will require released

time for teams of teachers during the day to meet with full-time teacher-trainers (clinical types). Teacher-trainers working with teachers can become not only the key in-service vehicle, but a key decision-making instrument. Teacher preparation institutions can be linked to these teams also. They offer unusual potential for preservice education. Moreover, the teacher-trainers could have joint appointments and offer credit for on-the-job experiences."

Also recognized by many seminar participants was the need for greatly expanded efforts to recruit and train at the undergraduate level teachers to instruct in schools where children are disadvantaged. Training for these teachers needs to emphasize the clinical experience in disadvantaged schools. More federal support is needed to make such programs possible at the undergraduate level.

f. View of teacher aides, paraprofessionals and community resource consultants.

"We need an extension of the definition of 'educators' to include, on a permanent basis, the new groups of paraprofessionals. We will add to

this, in time, other community people (many with very little formal education) as consultants and lecturers somewhere during the child's educational process, since knowledge of the community will be a vital part of the curriculum."

"The use of teacher aides should be greatly expanded in compensatory education programs."

g. View of program emphasis for Title I (ESEA) funds.

"A high priority should be placed on the expenditure of Title I funds for early childhood and early elementary programs."

Several participants warned, however, that compensatory education must not deal only with early childhood programs. One participant said: "Long range comprehensive programs from early childhood through adulthood and including the education of migrant families must be included. To isolate one age group and concentrate all efforts at that level only seems to create a split in the total family structure."

h. View of Educational Methods.

"Visual Literacy" programs and "Neighborhood Learning Centers" using tutorial and other approaches were

among the promising new methods described by seminar participants for making education more meaningful to disadvantaged children who are now being turned-off by the schools.

i. View of Federal policies concerning the form of compensatory education programs.

"The Federal policies must be flexible enough to meet the needs of Harlem in New York City and Harland County in Kentucky at the same time. Federal policies which are specifically designed to meet the needs of Harlem cannot be applied to Appalachia and vice versa.

"This is the basis of one of the primary criticisms of the Office of Education in implementing Title I. The policy in favor of focusing all of Title I on target areas was appropriate in the case of big cities with slums. However, it was wholly inappropriate for small towns like, for example, Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, or depressed rural areas in Appalachia and the South and in thinly settled areas in the Plains States.

"The legislative history of Title I was explicit with respect to upgrading an entire school system when the number of educationally deprived children constituted a majority of the children served by the

school system. It was thought this approach would be used in many of the rural areas of Appalachia and the South. However, not very much progress has yet been made in the upgrading of entire school systems.

"This failure to move more rapidly in upgrading entire school systems has denied disadvantaged children of educational advantaged due them: it has worked against programs for disadvantaged children both educationally and politically.

"The needs and desires of the poor people themselves were not sufficiently reflected in the decision-making process which developed the target school concept as a national model."

A sharpening of the ideas involved in the three principles discussed above may be found in the development of two contrasting "operational rationales" for compensatory education programs developed by Harland Randolph:

> The emerging operational rationale focuses on making educating relevant to life requirements and poverty conditions. This rational is almost always included in discussions of compensatory education, but in actual practice is seldom used by educational personnel.
>
> The standard operational rationale can be stated as follows: If special or extra instruction is given to students from poverty families who are performing below grade level, then their performance can be brought up to the level of their middle-class counterparts; if this level of educational achievement is reached, then poverty students will be able to compete with middle-class students for opportunities that will allow them to break out of poverty....

The emerging operational rationale is often stated in legislation, discussions, and reports regarding Title I programs. This rationale could be used as the base for program design and evaluation. The emerging (or implicit) operational rationale holds that: if education can be made relevant to the student's total range of needs (not just educational needs), then the student's coping skills will be improved, and this will result in desirable changes in his standard of living. This rationale also holds that the school has a dual responsibility--teaching students and changing the society in which the students live....

Within the emerging operational rationale, relevance of educational skills to life requirements and poverty is the principal criterion for program development. Instruction in reading, for example, is used to improve both reading and coping skills. This may be accomplished by using reading materials that are related to life in the student's community, by involving students in tutorial projects where they learn reading by helping others learn, by using reading as reinforcement for the development of listening skills, by relating reading to a community action project, or by other creative methods....

The standard rationale leads to programs that have the character of a closed system, i.e., educational needs, instructional programs and evaluation of performance in terms of the educational needs. The emerging rationale, on the other hand, leads to an open system, i.e., life requirements-poverty conditions, instructional experiences and evaluation in terms of the impact of instruction on poverty conditions.

A central issue resulting from the two operational rationales is: should schools assume a responsibility for insuring that their programs have some measurable and meaningful impact on the reduction of poverty in addition to meeting needs defined by the term educationally disadvantaged?

Principle 5

The making of needed changes in our schools will be greatly facilitated in an administrative structure in which democratically elected representatives of local parents and community shall have decisive power in determining school policy, program, personnel, budget, and evaluation within the framework of statewide and citywide regulations which apply to all schools. (Many of these local, state, and federal regulations must be changed because they work to the detriment of the disadvantaged child.)

Discussion

There was no question, as viewed by seminar participants, that greater participation of the parents and community in educational programs for the disadvantaged is desirable. Most participants also believed that the community should have greater control of their schools. Strong minority opinions were expressed, however, to the idea that communities should have complete control of their schools.

Kenneth Haskins stated the question of control in the following way:

> To what extent do the minority communities want to control their programs? The answer is, complete control. None of the present minority communities has the extent of control desired. They list the following, however, as essential elements that should be subject to their decision making: staffing, curriculum, finances, use of outside resources, use of physical plant, and planning for any new facilities.

Wayne Morse reviewed the historical development of the system of school control which now is under attack:

> A review of the history of education in last few decades will give a few clues as to why this disparity has come about, especially in the big cities. The public education system, with elected school boards and the community school, was developed in the rural areas of the country and later adapted to the cities, but prior to the phenomenon of the metropolitan spread. As our cities grew, the school system grew and the process for selecting school board members became further and further removed from the parents who sent their children to the school around the corner.
>
> The result was that the school boards for big-city school systems found themselves to be incapable of making decisions affecting individual schools and reflecting the desires of parents in those individual areas. School boards tended to delegate this responsibility to school administrators. All too often, then, the bureaucratic decision making process took control of the schools with the result that the parents and the school boards in too many instances have come to feel that they have too little influence in the formation of school programs particularly for disadvantaged children.
>
> The educational establishment controlling the bureaucracy in our public school system is the product of the schools of education in the United States and of our teacher colleges. Teacher education programs were designed a few decades ago to train teachers of white middle-class children. The school system favored was one where all children were to be taught at a level deemed to be normal or average and all children were to be fitted to that norm.

Mario Fantini pointed out that there are growing signs of revolt among students, parents, and communities because of dissatisfactions with what is happening in our schools. It all started with I.S. 201.

> In the fall of 1966, a new symptom surfaced on the face of urban education--a symptom so revealing that it was destined to trigger the most potent prescription

> yet developed for city school crises. At that time a group of parents and community residents in East Harlem effectively prevented the opening of a "model" school as an ultimate protest--a protest against the continued denial of quality education and equal opportunity to black and Puerto Rican children, and a protest against the insensitivity and unresponsiveness of a large school bureaucracy to the concerns and aspirations of the community. Intermediate School 201 (I.S. 201) has become a symbol for a different approach based on one of the most cherished ideals of our society--participation.

Teacher organizations generally express opposition to complete community control of schools, but David Selden of the American Federation of Teachers made this statement at the seminar:

> Teachers have much to gain from establishing better communication, acceptance, and understanding with parents and community leaders. While the extreme separatist form of community control and decentralization is designed to pit communities against teachers and the educational establishment, there is good reason to believe that a moderate dose of decentralization, as described in this paper, may help cure the racial polarization and alienation from which big city systems now suffer. Perceived in this light, teachers should seek to develop and establish viable decentralization plans.

One part of a plan which Selden suggested dealt with the problem of the big-city school boards which often were established originally by governmental reformers to get away from corrupt boss rule of wards:

> It is now obvious that the reformist efforts have swung too far away from grass roots control. One part of the remedy for this situation is to provide for elected boards of education, some members of which would be elected on an at-large basis and other members of which would be elected from area election districts, or wards, despite the admitted but not over-riding disadvantages inherent in such systems.

Other comments by participants supported the appeal for increased community participation:

> "Priorities with respect to allocation of Title I resources should be determined by local community groups."
>
> "Alternative strategies should be developed for promoting programs for children encompassed in the Elementary and Secondary Act when the local agency is unwilling to abide by Criteria #46 (having to do with involvement of people from the community)."
>
> "Parental selection of the principal makes possible the choice of an individual or type that might not otherwise qualify--the person they--not the establishment--want to supervise in the education of their children."
>
> "We in the black community believe we have the greatest investment in the schools--the minds of our children. We insist upon the right to determine what will be done with these minds."

Principle 6

The effectiveness of the educational program will be greatly enhanced through substantially increased financial support, the allotment of available school funds with priority given to areas of greatest educational need, and the establishment of communitywide structure for coordinating the school with other social agencies, including industrial and commerical agencies in the community.

Discussion

Seminar participants expressed the concern that there is simply not enough funding going into Title I to do the job. The fact that less money has actually been made available each year was viewed as most disheartening in the face of a need which remains critical. Present funding levels prevent the massive attacks needed to improve the education of the disadvantaged. Too much effort is being placed on "limited, experimental, and innovative" programs because of a shortage of funds, and not enough effort is being put into applying those things that we have learned will work on the scale necessary to assure a quality education for children of the poor.

Much has already been stated in this report on the importance of community involvement in compensatory education programs and no further discussion will be included at this point.

The heart of this sixth principle must be found in its call for "substantially increased financial support." What can those who are concerned about improving the educational opportunities for the disadvantaged do to help obtain needed support? A discussion of this aspect of principle six resulted in a definite call to action by the seminar group.

A CALL TO ACTION

In spite of the shortcomings of compensatory education programs recognized by seminar participants, there was a strong consensus that

compensatory education should be greatly expanded. It was felt that the cycle of "poor family-poor education-poor employment-poor family" which traps too many of our Nation's 22,000,000 poor must be broken at the education link.

Resolution

The seminar group adopted a resolution stating: "Persons concerned with compensatory education programs should organize and take those actions which will result in programs that are both comprehensive in scope and designed to deal with the large number of people needing these programs."

Discussion

Wayne Morse set the stage which led to the seminar group taking this action in his discussion of political strategies. He said:

> We have a terrific job to do in seeing to it that we carry out the primary obligation that our society owes its youth. You will never understand me on education unless you understand this obligation, which is that the people of this country are obligated to provide the opportunity for each and every boy and girl to develop to the maximum extent possible his or her intellectual potential by educational facilities and training being provided.

The political strategy for implementing programs for disadvantaged children as outlined by Morse could be summarized as developing strong programs, presenting the facts of these programs to the responsible publics, and trying, trying, trying to get support. Morse said:

> The best political strategy is to create successful education programs.
>
> What you need to recognize is that politicians at all levels don't know very much. The primary job of the politician holding legislative office is to function as a legislative juror and our job is to take the facts to him.

Recognized as a problem by the seminar was the fact that compensatory education under Title I does not have a constituency. Senator Morse indicated it should be able to develop one among the poor, and that representation before Congressional committees by the poor would probably be quite effective. This apparently easy solution became rather complicated, however, when it was discussed at the seminar. A minority group parent put it,

> Before I would testify at a hearing on these programs you would have to change things around a bit. The two questions you are asking are "How can we get more money?" and "How should we spend it?" I want to know first how you plan to spend it before I will help you get it.

Another participant from a minority group spelled it out is this way:

> If you compensatory education guys don't give us a piece of the action so there is a payoff that we can understand, we are not going to be your constituency when you need us to beat upon that system that is going to give you the capacity to give us something. The education establishment for the most part rejects you and you need us. In this society you talk about trade or compromise. Maybe what we want in trade is more control."

As the saying goes "that is where it is." For the establishment and those participants at the seminar it boiled down to a clean statement made by a black parent who said:

> You people in control of the establishment ask us, "What can we do to help?" What you can do is work on that establishment of yours to get us the money we need to educate our children. But you have to understand this: We don't want you telling us how we should use the money you get us when it comes to dealing with the minds of our children. We intend to control that.

For the seminar participants there were some reservations about the terms of the needed constituency. Among other groups in the country and in the legislative halls there no doubt would be more serious reservations. Though it was recognized that the political strategy in this situation will not be easy to formulate, it must be formulated. More effort must go into the educating of the disadvantaged on terms that are acceptable to the disadvantaged.

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

There have been many changes in programs for educating the disadvantaged through compensatory education in the few years of effort, and even more major changes loom ahead. These changes commanded the attention of the fifty participants in the Seminar for Educating the Disadvantaged.

Probably the most important change has been in terms of no longer looking at the child as failing the school but at the school as failing the child. This recognition has brought the school under great pressure to change. The following principle changes were advocated at the seminar:

1. Students, parents, and communities should greatly increase their participation in the affairs of the schools.
2. Schools in disadvantaged communities should more properly be considered community schools, and the communities more properly be considered integral parts of the learning environment.
3. Compensatory education should no longer be used by schools in disadvantaged communities to achieve equality in facilities

and personnel. Compensatory education should start to improve the educational opportunities in facilities where basic equalities have been achieved.

4. The educational establishment and particularly that part of it engaged in teacher training should open its closed system and be much more flexible and relevant. The roles of teacher and student need to become interchangeable at points; many new types of "teachers" should join the instructional team; teacher education should have a large clinical component; and responsibility and performance criteria should become the basis for certification and advancement.
5. There must be even more recognition that parents and their children, though poor, deserve to be treated with respect.
6. Educational programs for the disadvantaged must attack poverty and discrimination, the root causes for academic retardation among children of the poor.
7. Compensatory education should be funded at authorized levels because greatly increased inputs of funds for educating the disadvantaged are badly needed. It is increasingly recognized that the massive educational problems associated with poverty cannot be solved with pilot and innovative projects and experiments alone.

Seminar participants recognized the serious challenge of educating our disadvantaged children. Required will be both increased funds and new approaches. Many of the outlines for change were spelled out at the seminar, and participants left the University better equipped to help meet the challenges which lie immediately ahead.